

Sunday, April 21st 1991

Today's Topics:

Human visitors
Again?
Re: Statements of accepta
Re: Gravitational magnetism
Extraordinary Claims
Re: Statements of accepta
Moondome.Zip
Belgium Information (2)
Belgium Information (3)
Belgium Information (Conclusion)

From: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Greenen)
Subject: Human visitors
Date: 17 Apr 91 13:38:00 GMT

* Replying to a message originally to All
ee> From: snelson@eniach.seas.upenn.edu (Steven Nelson)
ee>
ee>
ee>
ee> Why are the visitors so humanlike? Given the
ee> complexity of the
ee> evolutionary process, the odds that aliens would have such
ee> a human shape as is
ee> commonly reported seems rather implausible. Parallel
ee> evolution adapts creatures
ee> that live in similar environments to similar shapes, yet
ee> certainly there's no
ee> reason to assume that our planet and any alien planet would
ee> be remotely
ee> similar.
ee> I hold out, at present, no explanations. I would
ee> not invalidate the
ee> phenomenon based on this point, but I find that this datum,
ee> which many
ee> researchers seem to ignore, is essential to understanding
ee> the UFO phenomenon.
ee>
ee> I use Whitley Streiber's term 'visitors' simply
ee> because it is less
ee> committal than the term 'aliens.'
ee>
ee> Does anyone have any comments?
ee>
ee> -Steve

Hi Steve; I think that if you look at what one single cell has done when a new child is born, you can apply that to the birth of a new planet or solar system. Very much the same but different. Have you thought about the possibility that we might be transplants from some other solar system. If you read the great book, it mentions the angels came down and mated with man. We can assume that a spirit can't mate with a mortal, then who were the angels they mention? Good question that could be debated and has for many centuries.

Also if you believe the people that have claimed to have seen or been in contact with aliens, you will get a lot of different types and shapes that are reported as you mentioned. This is what we should be researching in rather than debating if they are here or not.

73's ---Jim---

--

Jim Greenen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@p2.f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Again?
Date: 17 Apr 91 19:25:00 GMT

> Hmmm...isn't it about the time for them to gear up for the
> upcoming tourist season? This seems to be becoming a springtime
> ritual.

Good point. Seems like something happens early every April.

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@p2.f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Tender)
Subject: Re: Statements of acceptance
Date: 15 Apr 91 08:02:36 GMT

>> I am looking for statements they have committed to print and public

>> distribution;

JS> Sorry; can't really help you there. I do believe that the
JS> statements you seek exist in many places, most notably the
JS> Skeptical Inquirer, but I couldn't cite you specific references.

I was of the same 'impression' re the Skeptical Inquirer; what I can't understand is, when I ask people who I feel should be familiar with this material to give references, in order to substantiate or unsubstantiate the general impressions, I get nowhere. That says something, either about the material or the people.

>> Such statements would be quite valuable. It would at least show how
>> competent these guys are as scientists (assuming they would actually
>> write their own stuff) as opposed to propagandists.

JS> It is my impression that these guys are competent "scientific
JS> thinkers." (Define "scientist.") I am not by any stretch of the

I would rather define what is "scientific" rather than trust a "scientist" to be always "scientific".

So, now my stab at a definition of "scientific": 1) Objective and repeatable standards of measurement, 2) objective and consistent validation of data, uncoupled to any specific theory or hypothesis, 3) Explicit statement of all assumptions, 4) Explicit and quantitative formulation of theories, either algorithmically or heuristically.

JS> imagination a "scientist", but I believe I've got a grasp on
JS> how the thinking process goes. While I disagree with their
JS> parameters for evidence, I recognize that there is enough room
JS> for gentlemanly debate on the subject without stooping to the
JS> degree of vilification you seem to revel in. The bottom line

If the issue is still unclear, perhaps the "gentlemanly debate" hasn't been as productive as you think. Perhaps we should stoop to criticise improper thinking, even when our friends do it. On the other hand, I 'was' engaged in sarcastic parody at some points. For that, I'll apologize.

JS> is, I *do* believe that "these guys" will accept *SOMETHING*
JS> solid as evidence, and though they do seem to present a moving

All I'm trying to do is determine exactly what that "SOMETHING" is. As you know, it's not a question of belief; evidence acquired will make a specific hypothesis or theory (though in the case of UFO investigation, I think the term "explanation" is more accurate) either more probable or less probable. Granted, trying to develop a consistent and explicit process for evaluating exactly how much even "accepted" evidence bolsters any particular theory is not easy. However, materialist that I am, I assume that if the human mind is capable of doing it then we can, with sufficient technological resources, model the procedure, and in the process get rid of many of the aspects of human psychology that interfere with objectivity.

JS> target, I believe that, if UFOs are a genuine, physical
JS> phenomenon, it is within our power to gather the requisite
JS> amount of evidence to convince them. Of course, with some of

"Within our power" if they have explicit and reasoned standards of evidence.

>> When Rick, a member of the Bay Area Skeptics and CSICOP, evaded
>> this issue so persistently it merely reinforced a pattern I've seen in
>> skeptics before; using science when it is convenient, and ignoring it
>> otherwise.

JS> <sigh> I have seen that pattern in skeptics myself. I just
JS> don't see it in Rick, and I don't think you should be painting
JS> with such a broad brush.

Everyone has blind spots; I can't claim absolute correctness. I pointed out what I considered to be serious, and specific, lapses.

... from the purlieus of Pittsburgh

--

John Tender - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Tender)
Subject: Re: Gravitational magnetism
Date: 15 Apr 91 08:02:15 GMT

>> I got the impression that the mass goes through
>> the toroid, not the coils.
>>
KL> He's written back that the stellar mass goes through the
KL> coils and that the mass/movement is the cause of this
KL> gravitational magnetism.

Sounds like it would take quite a bit of energy to force the mass along that path. They'd better run a 440 line to the generator.

>> What are "Planck energy values"?

KL> Values of energies present at the birth of our universe.

If these are energy values, then the exact magnitude is meaningless, since we can arbitrarily choose whatever units we wish. In the comparison I made, the $10e40$ ratio is independent of the unit of measurement.

I'll try to look up a copy of Zee's book. In the meantime, two quick questions: Energies of what? At what time after the BB does this refer? ("birth" is a little ambiguous.)

KL> A. Zee, Gravity, an Old Man's Toy.

>>

>> The 10^{40} value for comparative field strength of
>> the EM force over the gravitational force comes from a
>> comparison of the field strengths for specific particles.

KL> Yes, but that's a misapplication of the forces involved with
KL> the scale of distances being used to carry this discussion.

It might be a misapplication, but not because of the scale. As I said, the ratio is valid for any distance, since both EM and G field strengths are proportional to $1/r^2$. There would be a problem with comparing the other fundamental interactions, since they do not share the same property.

... from the purlieus of Pittsburgh

--

John Tender - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Tender)

Subject: Extraordinary Claims

Date: 17 Apr 91 08:25:42 GMT

RM> A claim is extraordinary if its acceptance would require
RM> rejecting massive amounts of well- (if tentatively) accepted,
RM> accumulated knowledge. This happened, for example, when

All scientific knowledge is tentative.

You've described an extraordinary claim; what is "extraordinary evidence"?

RM> geologists suddenly accepted plate tectonics in the early '60s,
RM> when the quantity and quality of evidence _for_ tectonics
RM> became convincing -- after 45 years. It has never happened,
RM> for example, with Charles Fort's hollow-earth theories, since
RM> that evidence is, um, unconvincing.

Exactly what were the "massive amounts of well- (if tentatively) accepted, accumulated knowledge" that were rejected (or if I can interject the term contradicted) by the theory of plate tectonics?

Based on what I know of the situation, it was considered "extraordinary" only in the sense that no known mechanism could be supplied to account for the movements of the plates. In other words, it just didn't "fit in". That's a much different (and weaker) reason to label something "extraordinary" than the one you described. Unfortunately, I suspect it is also more often the case.

RM> This is --not-- a double-standard, since it is just a corollary
RM> of the maxim that all claims should be supported by
RM> appropriate evidence. (The preponderance of quantity and
RM> quality rules.) >>

Adopting this "maxim" means that there should be clear and specific methods for determining what is "appropriate" evidence; otherwise, you are right, it's not a double standard, it's a non-standard supporting only non-science. Where can I get a copy of such rules and methods?

RM> That statement is also frequently used to discourage honest
RM> research into certain subjects....

RM> For the record, as I have said here many, many times, I'm all
RM> in favour of honest research, regardless of subject.
RM> In other words, a (real or imagined) lack of proof is often
RM> used to rationalize avoiding the very investigation that would
RM> be required to develop such proof in the first place.

RM> For the record, I'm against imagining a lack of proof.

RM> For the record, I'm against rationalising.

RM> For the record, I'm all in favour of investigations.

For the record, it's too bad saying something over and over doesn't make the statement any more valid.

What's the point of favoring the investigations if you reserve the right to 'arbitrarily' decide if the evidence they provide are valid?

RM> If anything, 'extraordinary' claims (assuming one is
RM> interested enough to follow them up in the first place)
RM> require extraordinarily openminded, careful and resourceful
RM> science....

What 'specific' qualities distinguish "extraordinarily openminded, careful and resourceful science" from the "run-of-the-mill" science. I doubt that it can be the same as the criteria for extraordinary evidence, i.e. it contradicts massive amounts of accepted science.

RM> RM> For the record, I'm absolutely keen on open-minded, careful,
and RM> resourceful science. RM> >> ...Period. RM> RM> Period, as long
as one realises that any very surprising RM> result, whose acceptance
would require massive revisions in RM> accepted scientific knowledge,
will need to have strong RM> evidence. This is the ordinary standard

of science, and RM> applies equally to Alfred Wegener, father of plate tectonics, RM> and to Robert Jahn of the Princeton PK experiments. No more, no RM> less.

Nice platitudes; it's just unfortunate the real world isn't that way. All too often evidence is rejected not because it contradicts massive amounts of other evidence, but because there is no mechanism or model to "explain" the data, or because of a superficial similarity to a separate theory that was discredited.

Submitted for your consideration: 120 years ago Bill Scientist notes a correlation between weather patterns on earth and sunspot activity. The scientist is ridiculed, because it is such a ridiculous idea; "How could the sun influence the earth through the void of space? Besides, these crackpots are linking sunspots with everything. The evidence is obviously faulty; I reject it."

Second submission: Joe Psychic claims he is receiving messages from extraterrestrial entities based on Pluto. Is this claim "extraordinary"? If so, what massive amounts of valid evidence are contradicted by this claim.

RM> Some people just won't accept that standard (Velikovsky, RM> Reich...). That's fine, but then what they do isn't science.

Science also requires explicit and objective criteria that are consistently applied; as long as that is lacking for the term "extraordinary", it has no place in science.

BTW, aren't you grandstanding on this "scientific standards" thing. Will you just let these guys use whatever standards they damn well please and quit whining. (sarcasm flag)

... from the purlieus of Pittsburgh

--

John Tender - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Tender)
Subject: Re: Statements of acceptance
Date: 17 Apr 91 08:40:25 GMT

>> The good [text files] should be presented so that they may be acted
>> on, and the bad ones, so that they may stand as examples of how NOT
>> to think. I suspect that if Rick kept the files up because he damn
>> well felt like it, this may be WHY he damn well felt like it.

RM> Thank you. That's pretty much the real reason (and it's never

RM> been an issue in these parts). It's just that whenever people
RM> start grandstanding to me about how sysops should run their
RM> boards (as opposed to making suggestions), I simply tell them
RM> to go hang. Sysops get a continual parade of such folk, and I
RM> have little patience for them.

Rick, you have a tendency to twist any criticism into a personal attack. Don't. I replied to another message here in which 'you' assert that scientific principles have to be followed consistently. My statements about deleting files arbitrarily, or distributing files without warning as to known contradictions, were in line with (at least what I consider to be) valid scientific principles. And yes, you 'don't' get to make your own rules 'if' you want to adhere to scientifically correct procedures. All I did was to point that out. Run your board however you wish, but it is certainly valid to judge you on your decisions.

Perhaps what you have little patience for is being held to your own standards.

RM> I have less patience when the grandstanding is just another
RM> ploy in a tiresome smear campaign, and none at all when that
RM> campaign has extended (notwithstanding allegations to the
RM> contrary) over a two year period in the FidoNet SCIENCE,
RM> PHYSICS, and UFO conferences -- and now here, too.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN? Get real. You construe a consistent argument about certain "scientific" standards of evidence as a smear campaign. That is not in keeping with your claims about "open-minded" debate.

Can you proffer any evidence of this SMEAR CAMPAIGN? Maybe the people on 'this' echo would like to see more than your vague allegations. I detect an overabundance of paranoia that is usually more characteristic of those making what skeptics label as "claims of the paranormal".

RM> Again, notwithstanding allegations to the contrary, I advocated
RM> sysops' classifying download files as "Sysop's Picks" or other
RM> only as a less drastic alternative to deleting Cooper's files.

There were never any "allegations to the contrary". Again, all I wanted were the criteria for classifying the files, and pointed out that "because I damn well felt like it" lacked a certain measure of scientific correctness. I really don't want to harp on this, but if you are going to misrepresent the situation, I have to.

RM> Once more, notwithstanding allegations to the contrary, I am
RM> not a "member" of CSICOP. I serve on its Electronic
RM> Communications Subcommittee, offering it advice and help in
RM> that area, and do not presume to speak for it. (To find out
RM> CSICOP's views, contact CSICOP.) I do speak for Bay Area
RM> Skeptics, however.

I apologize. It was totally inappropriate for me to interpret your

signature line:

"Best Regards,
Rick Moen, Secretary
Bay Area Skeptics
Member, Electronic Communications Subcommittee, CSICOP"

as implying that you were a member of CSICOP. How foolish of me. I'm sorry if I caused any confusion by doing such a damnably stupid thing. Thanks for the clarification.

Would it be appropriate for me to ask if you support CSICOP's views?

RM> My occasional and long-time correspondent John Tender _has_,
RM> however, suggested (in a roundabout way) a useful project:
RM> Writing to Klass, Oberg, Sheaffer, other members of CSICOP's
RM> UFO Subcommittee, and to other prominent UFologists, and ask
RM> them _formally_ what they would accept as convincing evidence
RM> of the ET UFO hypothesis. (Allegations to the contrary, I
RM> never stated that Klass, Oberg, and Sheaffer had _published_
RM> such statements, only that they had "said" what would convince
RM> them. They _may_ have published this; I don't remember.)
RM> Perhaps someone else in ParaNet could do this -- I'm swamped.

OK, they "said" it. (But they were whispering over in the corner and everyone else was too tired and nobody remembers it and they said it in small dribbles here and there and no one has 'any' record of it but they said it, maybe not clearly and maybe they were wrong and who am I to judge, but they definitely said it.) OK.

Gee, you saw something useful in my messages? I'll have to remember to restrain my remarks to smearing you character and filter out that useful stuff. (sarcasm alert)

RM> In my opinion, any skeptic who considers himself an authority
RM> on UFOlogy (which I've consistently said I'm _not_, remember)
RM> should be able to provide a clear -- and serious -- answer to
RM> that question. For that matter, so should any other avowedly
RM> serious UFologist.

>> I *believe* Klass is looking for some kind of statement from a body
>> such as the National Academy of Sciences...

RM> The _Betelgeusian_ Academy of Sciences? <grin>

Kim Basinger?

RM> I think Phil Klass can probably specify a little better than
RM> that. Fortunately, he's not at all difficult to reach. You can
RM> tell him that Moen is stirring up trouble again.

RM> Best Regards,
RM> Rick M.

... from the purlieus of Pittsburgh

--

John Tender - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Clark.Matthews@f816.n107.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Clark Matthews)
Subject: Moondome.Zip
Date: 19 Apr 91 08:12:00 GMT

Linda, I'm happy to report the file MOONDOME.ZIP is online here.

I have forwarded a copy to Mike Corbin at ParaNet Alpha for distribution here.

The file is text only, no illustrations. I hope to supplement it with scanned art & photos when time allows. Thank you for your patience and good reading!

Best,
Clark

--

Clark Matthews - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Clark.Matthews@f816.n107.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: ParaNet.Information.Service@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (sm)
Subject: Belgium Information (2)
Date: 18 Apr 91 01:14:00 GMT

<<Continued from previous message>>

It is perhaps because the objects are so far unidentified, that the Belgian Air Force has undertaken the task of chasing and investigating the intruders. As Col. Wilfried de Brouwer, the Chief of Operations of the Belgian Air Force who is coordinating the UFO investigation, told The Wall Street Journal, "Our approach is that it's our job to see what's going on." Indeed, the UFO flap climaxed on the night of March 30-31 of 1990, when unknown targets were tracked by two radar installations. The one

at Glons, located southeast of Brussels, belongs to the NATO defense group - NATO Headquarters is in Brussels - while that at Semmerzake, west of Brussels, is in charge of controlling all military and civilian traffic in the entire Belgian territory. At that point, the master-controller at Glons ordered the scramble of two F-16 interceptors, which also locked the UFO on their onboard radars.

We have obtained, courtesy of French researcher Jean-Luc Rivera, a copy of the complete report of this incident, which was prepared by Air Force Major P. Lambrechts, from the Air Force General Staff in Brussels, and which was forwarded to the SOBEPS following the instructions of full cooperation with that group. The "Report Concerning the Observation of UFOs During the Night of March 30 to 31, 1990," includes a full chronology of the events, as well as a thick dossier of enclosures with eyewitness' descriptions from several gendarmes and maps of where the sightings took place.

Major P. Lambrechts explains at the inception that, "the observations both visual and by radar were of such nature, that it was decided to order the scramble of two F-16 aircraft with the goal of identifying these UFOs." The report also indicates that "the presence or testing of B2 or F117 (Stealth Bomber), RPVs (Remotely Piloted Vehicles), ULMs (Ultra Light Motorized) and AWACS at the moment of these events in the Belgian airspace, can be excluded. "

According to the Chronology, the Sequence of events began at 22.50 hours, when the "master controller at Glons " received a telephone call from gendarme Renquin, who reported he was seeing from his house in Ramillies, "three unusual lights. . . forming an equilateral triangle, and with changing colors of red, green and yellow." At 23.05, the Gendarmerie at Wavre sent a patrol, which confirmed the observation. At 23.15, Renquin called again to inform that he was seeing a new set of three lights, while the radar screens at Glons detected " an unidentified contact moving at a speed of around 25 knots." (A knot is equivalent to one nautical mile - 6,080 feet - per hour.)

For the next two and a half hours, an increasing number of gendarmes and other witnesses continued to observe the strange maneuvers of up to three sets of triangular lights in the outskirts of Brussels. By 23.49 hours, the radar screens at Semmerzake confirmed the targets and the order to scramble two F-16s was given at 23.56 hours, taking off at 00.05 on March 31. According to the report, "the aircraft had brief radar contacts on several occasions." However, each time that "the pilots were able to secure a lock on one of the targets for a few seconds, this resulted each time in a drastic change in the behavior of the UFOs."

During the first lock on at 00.13, continues the report, "the speed of the target changed in a minimum of time from 150 to 970 knots and from 9,000 to 5,000 feet, returning then to 11,000 feet, in order to change again to close to ground level; this resulted in a 'break lock' in a few seconds and the pilots lost the radar contact." In another lock on at 00.30 hours, the "break lock" was achieved by what the report calls "a jamming signal on

the screen."

Col. de Brouwer explained to Paris Match reporter Marie-Therese de Brosses, that the change of velocity from 280 KPM to 1,800 KPH while descending from 3,000 meters to 1,000 meters in one second, was a fantastic acceleration equivalent to 40 Gs. This would exclude any human pilot onboard the UFO, since humans can only withstand 8 Gs. (A "G " is a unit of acceleration equivalent to the gravitational pull of the earth, 9.81 m/sec/sec.) When the UFO approached the ground level, continued Col. de Brouwer, "it was out of the question for the F-16 to catch up with the object at this low altitude, where the density of the air limits the speed to 1,300 KMP. Above that speed, the temperature in the compressors of the jet turbines would cause the engines to burst. There was a logic behind the motions of the object," added the Colonel.

In any case, the cat and mouse game went on until shortly after 1 am, when the F-16s were ordered to return to their base. On the ground, however, Captain Pinson and other gendarmes continued to observe "four white luminous spots forming a square" until around 1.30, when "the four UFOs lost their luminosity and seemed to disappear in four different directions." Significantly, the weather conditions on that night were very clear, allowing ground witnesses to observe the objects in detail, as well as the pursuit by the F-16s. The pilots, however, did not observe the objects visually.

Major Lambrechts finally excludes a number of alternative hypotheses for the UFOs, such as "optical illusions, confusion with planets or other meteorological phenomena... weather balloons. . . or meteorological inversions. . . holographic projections," etc. More importantly, he writes that "the speeds measured at the moment of the change of altitudes, exclude the hypothesis that the UFOs observed could be confused with aircraft. " Still more puzzling was the fact that, "despite that on several occasions high speeds above the speed of the sound barrier were measured, the shock wave was never observed. Here, no explanation can be given." The French physicist Jean Pierre Petit concurred: "In reality," he told Paris Match, "there is no machine made by man, either an airplane or a missile, that is capable of such performance. Specifically, flying at the speed of sound without making a sonic boom."

<<Continued in next message...>>

--

ParaNet(sm) Information Service - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: ParaNet(sm).Information.Service@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: ParaNet.Information.Service@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (sm)
Subject: Belgium Information (3)
Date: 18 Apr 91 01:15:00 GMT

<<<Continued from previous message>>>

Although the Belgian military authorities have insisted that the UFOs in Wallonia are no secret aircraft, the similarities between the triangular craft seen in Belgium with the boomerang-shaped objects reported throughout the last decade in the Hudson Valley in New York and Western Connecticut, as well as other triangular UFOs observed in Wytheville, Virginia, Fyffe, Alabama, and Puerto Rico, among other places, have led some researchers to suggest that the technology behind all these observations is terrestrial and not extraterrestrial.

The similarity between the Belgian and Hudson Valley flaps was noted by SOBEPS investigator Patrick Ferryn. Commenting on the book *Night Siege* by the late Dr. Allen Hynek, investigator Phillip Imbrogno and reporter Bob Pratt, which documented the Hudson Valley cases, Ferryn wrote that "changing only a few words, exactly the same could be written to give an account of the position of affairs here! [in Belgium] The same goes for many entire pages and excerpts elsewhere in the book."

While nobody doubts that people have been seeing something in both upstate New York and Wallonia in Belgium, the big question is whether these sightings are caused by true UFOs or by some kind of new revolutionary secret military aircraft. Foremost among the proponents of the secret weapon theory is Tony Gonsalves, a researcher from East Providence, Rhode Island, who served as a jet mechanic and plane captain for the U.S. Navy on three aircraft carriers between 1959 and 1963.

In a number of papers written during the last two years, Gonsalves has developed his theory of "The American made UFO" - that the boomerangs of Westchester and Dutchess counties, as well as the triangular UFOs of Belgium, Virginia and Puerto Rico, are actually a modified covert version of the B-2 Stealth Bomber. Gonsalves believes this craft has been fully operational since the early 80s, while the official B-2 bomber that was unveiled in 1988 is a "decoy" to deceive the American public, the media and the Congress. Furthermore, Tony Gonsalves and a few other ufologists speculate that this secret aircraft may even incorporate some alien technology obtained from UFO crashes decades ago.

Gonsalves' theory seemed to gain some credibility when *Aviation Week & Space Technology* magazine reported in its October 1, 1990 edition that, "large, triangular wing-shaped aircraft" are indeed being tested out of the Nellis Air Force range in Nevada and the Tehachapi Mountains near Edwards AFB in California. The well known aerospace magazine mentioned several sightings by engineers of "triangular-shaped aircraft, " possibly prototypes for the A-12, the Navy's new Stealth attack plane, and one or several versions for reconnaissance aircraft cloaked under the top secret code of Aurora, to replace the old Lockheed SR-71 "Blackbird" which was recently mothballed. *Aviation Week* (sometimes referred

by the nickname of "Aviation Leak") also quoted Air Force sources who "acknowledged that diamond and triangular-shaped vehicles are 'the trend now,'" as well as unconfirmed reports that some of these aircraft "were designed to operate at speeds around Mach 10 or higher."

Because he worked for over 30 years as senior editor of Aviation Week, where he is still a contributing editor, we sought the opinion of well known UFO debunker Phillip Klass as to whether there could be any validity to explain the Hudson Valley and Belgian flaps with Secret military aircraft, Stealth or otherwise. "In my opinion the answer is absolutely not," responded Klass, adding that only those sightings "in the vicinity of Nellis Air Force Base" in Nevada could be caused by military aircraft tests. "If there were a secret airplane, " continued Klass, "for goodness' sake, the last place in the world you'd want to fly it is in Dutchess County, where people have been alerted to look for objects."

Although they certainly disagree on the final cause of the sightings, Klass and Phillip Imbrogno seem to be in full agreement in their rejection of Tony Gonsalves' Stealth theory. "I can't see the government testing a top secret device in an area like this, " said Imbrogno. "Number one, what if they have a problem, what if they crash?" Imbrogno said he had considered this possibility when he first looked into the boomerang sightings, but that "I am convinced right now that the Hudson Valley UFO is not an aircraft, Stealth or otherwise. Number two, I am not totally convinced that it's from outerspace. Number three, I don't know what the hell it is."

Meanwhile, sightings continue to pile up in Europe. The latest case before we go to press was reported in early November, when "mystery shapes in the sky, variously described as orange balls, triangles and points of light," were reported in France, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland and Italy, according to a newswire report from the Reuter's news agency. Police phone lines were flooded across the continent with calls about unidentified flying objects. Experts in Munich speculated the sightings could have been triggered by the explosion of a meteorite. However, this explanation could hardly satisfy the familiar sightings in Belgium, where "dozens of people reported a triangular object with three lights flying slowly and soundlessly to the southwest," according to the Reuter report.

The Belgian Air Force was studying once again the case, and so was France's Service for the Investigation of Re-entry Phenomena (SEPRA), which is attached to the French National Space Agency in Toulouse and was formerly known as GEPAN. One Air France pilot told a radio interviewer: "We were on a flight to Barcelona (Spain) at about 33,000 feet at about 7 pm when we first saw the shape. It couldn't have been a satellite because it was there for three or four minutes."

If the sightings in Belgium and elsewhere turn out to be secret aircraft, the mystery will become public sooner or later, but if they are indeed caused by true UFOs, then we may be debating them for a long time to come. Perhaps a summary of the whole Belgian flap and its meaning was best expressed by SOBEPS Scientist

August Meessen, Professor of Physics at the Catholic University at Louvain. He told the French magazine Paris Match: "There are too many independent eyewitness reports to ignore. Too many of the reports describe coherent physical effects, and there is an agreement among the accounts concerning what was observed. If all of these witnesses are lying, then it is a mental disease of such novelty and proportions that it must be studied."

<<Concluded in next message...>>

--

ParaNet(sm) Information Service - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: ParaNet(sm).Information.Service@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: ParaNet.Information.Service@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (sm)
Subject: Belgium Information (Conclusion)
Date: 18 Apr 91 01:16:00 GMT

<<<<Continued from previous message>>>>

"But of course," continued Prof. Meessen, "there are also physical effects. The Air Force report allows us to approach the problem in a rational and scientific way. The simplest hypothesis is that the reports are caused by extraterrestrial visitors, but that hypothesis carries with it other problems. We are not in a rush to form a conclusion, but continue to study the mystery." The last word about the UFO flap that has brought down "The Wall" of UFO Silence has yet to be uttered.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR Chilean-American journalist Antonio Huneus was born in New York in 1950, the son of a Chilean diplomat and United States official. After studying French at the Sorbonne University in Paris in 1970 and journalism at the University of Chile, he worked as science editor for a weekly magazine in Santiago and was a contributor for a number of newspapers. Huneus' UFO investigation began in 1977 with the bizarre "time warp" incident of Chilean Army Corporal Armando Valdes. Since then, he has written hundreds of articles on UFOs and related subjects for such publications as Omni, UFO Report, and the MUFON JOURNAL in the U.S., as well as for magazines throughout South America and Europe. Last year he won the UFologists of the Year Award given by the National UFO Conference. The photographs and art that accompany this article are part of Antonio's UFO CHRONICLE lecture and slide presentation. Readers may reach the author directly at Box 1989, New York, NY 10159.

END

PARANET FILE NAME: BELGIUM1.UFO

--

ParaNet(sm) Information Service - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: ParaNet(sm).Information.Service@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

*****To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to*****
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara

DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com

ADMIN Address infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com

{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

*****The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter*****